



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,190	12/22/2004	Achim Grefenstein	12810-00006-US	6808
30678 7590 09/29/2008 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP 1875 EYE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20006				
EXAMINER				
KRUEER, KEVIN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/519,190

Applicant(s)

GREFENSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

KEVIN R. KRUEER

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12,13,15-21,23,25,26 and 28-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 22, 24, and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/888)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 30, 2008 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 12, 13, 15-21, 23, 25, 26, and 28-31 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on February 9, 2007. The examiner notes the improper status identifier was used for claims 12, 13, 15-21, 23, 25, 26, and 28-30. Said claims are currently "withdrawn" from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 14, 22, 24, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in view of Gaggar et al (US 7,135,233) in view of WO 2001/083574 (herein referred to as "Breulmann"). US 2003/0105225A1 has been utilized as an

English translation of the Breulmann reference and all citations herein refer to the U.S. publication.

Gaggar teaches a laminate comprising an acrylate outer layer, an acrylonitrile-styrene-acrylate copolymer intermediate layer, an ABS layer, and a fourth layer made of acrylate (abstract). The outer acrylate layer is herein understood to read on the claimed backing layer. The fourth layer may comprise ABS or ASA and is herein understood to read on the claimed outer layer. The composite is thermoformed.

Gaggar does not teach the ABS layer should comprise the claimed "substrate layer" composition. However, Breulmann teaches a composition that has better notch impact resistance, toughness, penetration energy, flowability, and surface gloss than ABS (008 and 002). The graft copolymer molding composition comprises:

a1: from 10 to 90% by weight of a particulate graft base A1, made from a particulate emulsion polymer with a glass transition temperature below 0°C made from

all: from 70 to 100% by weight of butadiene or of at least one C1.8-alkyl acrylate, or of mixtures of these, as component A11,

a12: from 0 to 20% by weight of at least one polyfunctional crosslinking monomer, as component A12,

a13: from 0 to 30% by weight of other copolymerizable monomers, as component A13, the total amount of these being 100% by weight,

a2: from 10 to 90% by weight of a graft A2 made from the following monomers, the amounts being based on A2,

a21: from 60 to 100% by weight of at least one vinylaromatic monomer, or of a (meth)acrylic ester or of mixtures of these, as component A21, and

a22: from 0 to 40% by weight of at least one ethylenically unsaturated monomer, as component A22,

has a median particle diameter of from 130 to 500 nm and has polymodal particle size distribution in which less than 40% by weight of the particles are present in any particle size range of width 50 nm (abstract). The composition further comprises component B which comprises 60-100% by weight of vinylaromatic monomers and 0-40% by weight of an ethylenically unsaturated monomer, preferably of acrylonitrile or methyl methacrylate (0068-0070). Thus, it would have been obvious to utilize the composition taught in Breulmann in place of the ABS layer taught in Gaggar in order to improve the impact resistance, mechanical properties, toughness, and flowability of layer (C).

With regards to claim 22, Gaggar does not teach the claimed thickness. However, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to vary the thickness of the composite sheet according to the desired end use of the product.

With regards to claim 27, the properties claimed therein are understood to be inherent to the composition taught by Gaggar in view of Breulmann since said composition/laminate is compositionally identical to the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 30, 2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN R. KRUEER whose telephone number is (571)272-1510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin R Krueer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794